

Docket No. F-6961

Ser. No. 09/842,931

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the final Office Action of December 14, 2004. Entry of the Amendments and consideration of the remarks are respectfully requested and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12 and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watari et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,197) as modified by Yamashita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,377).

In response to the rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite that "forming display images of all the three-dimensional objects of an identical shape at different positions". This is because the invention produces images of a plurality of three-dimensional objects of an identical shape at different positions by the perspective projection conversion by using the same polygon data and a plurality of different perspective conversion matrices.

In the example described in the specification, the object 50 is formed by three polygons A to C. By performing the perspective projection conversion of the polygons A to C by using a plurality of different perspective conversion matrices, the plurality of different images of objects of an identical shape at different positions as shown in FIG. 5 can be produced. Namely, in the present

Docket No. F-6961

Ser. No. 09/842,931

invention, the plurality of different conversion matrices prepared in advance are all used for the conversion of each of the polygon data to produce plural images of the objects of an identical shape at different positions.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that all claims judged to be unpatentable over the references Watari and Yamashita. However, in the present invention, the plurality of conversion matrices is used at the same time for the same polygon data to produce a plurality of images of objects of an identical shape at different positions. Watari and Yamashita fail to teach or suggest this feature. Rather, Watari teaches at figures 6A to 6D and at column 3, line 65 and Yamashita teaches at column 5, line 60 that the images are modified while being translated to different locations. Therefore, imaging the plurality of objects of an identical shape at different positions on the projection plane of the view point coordinate system at the same time in the claimed invention differs from Watari and Yamashita. Accordingly, the amended independent claims patentably distinguish over Watari and Yamashita. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) (a prima face case of obviousness is established only where the combination of cited references teaches or suggests each limitation in the claim).

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$450.00 for the extension is

Docket No. F-6961


Ser. No. 09/842,931

provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038,
Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.


If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment
authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038
is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the
USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit
any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper
form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By 
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

and,

By 
T. David Bomzer
Reg. No. 48,770
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340